1.2.340
#19

Lillian & Harold Weisberg

Coq d'Or Press ROUTE 8, FREDERICK, MD. 21701

Code 301 / 473-8186

11/24/69

Mr. Thomas J. Kelley
Assistant Director
U.S. Secret Service
Washington, D.C. 20226

Dear Mr. Kelley,

Dr. Rhoads has forwarded your letter of the 3rd and its enclosures. Although this is in sharp contradiction to the existing record, I do assure you I welcome this, am grateful for it, and want very much to believe it marks a shift to a new and proper policy. I hope you will review the earlier file and correct any other errors.

Some questions remain. I write in an effort to get the answers.

You say "we do not have" copies of the two receipts of 11/22/63 (one may be 11/23/63) for the sheet, drapes and shroud and for the photographic materials. I believe these papers were directed to you. Can you obtain copies for me from whomever you gave them to, or can you direct me to them? These receipts certainly must exist within the government.

Part of the certificate of death is illegible. Are the words after "immediate cause" "Gu shot of Brain"? After 22c, what is the signature?

Rather than a "letter" from Captain Stover "concerning laws and regulations regarding the confidential nature of the events" there is an unaddressed memorandum from him which deals with neither. I can understand that under the circumstances the language may have been imprecise, but I am asking is this memo the letter referred to or is there something else?

The Archives cannot identify for me the "missile" for which the FBI agents signed a receipt. They suggest CE843, which is not a single object but seems to be not fewer than three tiny fragments the largest of which would hardly be called a "missile". Yet there is the receipt for but one object. Can you identify this "missile" for me in the evidence and do you know of any other similar receipts, including for what the 1968 panel report describes as a "rectangular structure"?

The 11/23/63 letter to Admiral Burkley from Dr. Kemp Clark was removed by the Warren Commission when it published the accompanying "summary". Can you tell me why, if you know, and the source of what was substituted in the Report and in Exhibit 392? Was this done before the document reached the Commission, if you know?

Existing official accounts of the photographic materials are inconsistent and contradictory. This is one of the reasons I seek the receipt for them. Have you any list or tabulation of them and can you account for the reported damages?